

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed January 21, 2004 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1-5 and 7 are canceled. Claims 6 and 8-11 are pending in this application, with claims 6 and 9 being the only independent claims. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as herein amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action mailed January 21, 2004, claims 6 and 8-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,642,600 (Hooper) in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,999,696 (Reba) and U.S. Patent No. 5,947,408 (Miyake).

In accordance with the invention as recited in amended independent claims 6 and 9, the end of a wide wrapper sheet is detected by rotating the wrapper roll against a wrapper feeding direction and drawing the end of the wrapper backwards over a detector. To accomplish this detection, the end of the wrapper must be reliably led over a feeding table and the detectors. The end of the wrapper is so led by employing air nozzles that blow air between the wrapper and feeding table. The air nozzles provide an air cushion between the table and the wrapper sheet, which guarantees a free flow of the wrapper. Simultaneously, the air flow between two flat surfaces creates a negative pressure that keeps the wrapper flat over the air cushion which ensures that the wrapper end will be detected. After the end of the wrapper is detected, the wrapper roll is rotated forward until the wrapper end passes the drawing rolls and is detected by a sensor or indicator positioned after the drawing rolls.

Hooper discloses a method and apparatus for wrapping paper rolls. As acknowledged by the Examiner, Hooper does not disclose that a leading edge of the web is guided to the drawing rollers by an air nozzle, as recited in independent claims 6 and 9, or that the supply roll is turned in a reverse direction until the leading edge is sensed on the table, also as recited in independent claims 6 and 9. Also as acknowledged by the Examiner, the combination of Hooper and Reba does not disclose the supply roll being turned in a reverse direction until the leading edge is sensed on the table. It is further noted that Hooper and Reba also fail to disclose an indicator or sensor positioned after the drawing rolls. As discussed below, the combination of Hooper, Reba, and Miyake is an improper combination and even if it is not deemed improper, the proposed combination does not result in the invention recited in independent claims 6 and 9.

Hooper and Reba relate to very different fields. Hooper relates to an apparatus for packing rolls of paper while Reba discloses an apparatus used in the manufacture of continuous

webs. In Reba, the webs that are manufactured move at very high speeds and web breaks must be handled rapidly. In wrapping apparatus and apparatus for packing rolls, the wrapper moves relatively slowly in comparison to the manufacturing speeds. For example, Reba contemplates that the web moves at speeds of up to 2400 feet per minute (see col. 3, lines 53-56). In contrast, the present invention and Hooper are designed to feed wrapper paper for wrapping rolls and does not require that the wrapper paper reach anywhere near that speed. Accordingly, it would not be obvious to use the technique for handling the web in both cases. That is, there is no motivation for combining the web handling technique of Reba with the apparatus for wrapping a paper roll disclosed by Hooper. Even if the teaching of Hooper and Reba were combined, the Examiner has acknowledged that the combination of Hooper and Reba does not disclose the supply roll being turned in a reverse direction until the leading edge is sensed on the table.

It is respectfully submitted that Miyake fails to teach or suggest what Hooper and Reba lack because (1) there is no motivation for combining the teaching of Miyake with the teachings of Hooper and Reba, and (2) even if the teachings of Miyake were combined, Miyake still fails to teach or suggest stopping rotation of the wrapper roll when falling of the wrapper end on the surface of the wrapper feeding table has been detected and rotating the wrapper roll in the wrapper feeding direction until the wrapper end passes an indicator positioned after the wrapper proportioning drawing rolls, as expressly recited in independent claims 6 and 9.

Miyake discloses a recording device using continuous paper. The Examiner alleges that Miyake discloses a turning a roll in the reverse direction until the leading edge is sensed on the table. However, Miyake relates to the use of a roll of narrow paper such as for tickets and the present invention, and Hooper, relate to large roll packing machinery. Accordingly, there is no motivation for one skilled in the art of roll packing machinery to look at machine for manufacturing ticket rolls as disclosed in Miyake. Thus independent claims 6 and 9 are allowable over Hooper, Reba, and Miyake for this reason.

Furthermore, Miyake discloses a sensor 55 for reading bar codes 41 (see col. 4, lines 11-14). This type of sensor would not be operable with the wrapper rolls disclosed by the present invention because the wrapper rolls do not have bar codes. Furthermore, it would not be obvious to add bar codes to the wrapper rolls. Independent claim 6 and 9 are therefore allowable over Hooper, Reba, and Miyake for these additional reasons.

In addition, independent claims 6 and 9 each further recite that after the wrapper end is detected, the wrapper roll is then rotated forward until the wrapper end passes an indicator after the wrapper proportioning drawing rolls. Miyake fails to teach or suggest wrapper proportioning drawing rolls because Miyake relates to a recording device which uses narrow recording paper such as for tickets (see col. 4, line 63 to col. 5, line 1). Furthermore, neither Hooper nor Reba disclose an indicator after wrapper proportioning drawing rolls.

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 6 and 9 are allowable over Hooper, Reba, and Miyake.

Dependent claims 8 and 10-11, being dependent on independent claims 6 and 9, are deemed allowable for the same reasons expressed above with respect to independent claims 6 and 9.


The application is now deemed to be in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is solicited.

It is believed that no fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application; however, if any fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE

By


Alfred W. Froebrich
Reg. No. 38,887
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: April 21, 2004